

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/766,774	01/28/2004	Richard K. Williams	AAT007-3C US	8283
34036	6 7590 07/27/2005		EXAMINER	
SILICON VALLEY PATENT GROUP LLP 2350 MISSION COLLEGE BOULEVARD			WILCZEWSKI, MARY A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 360 SANTA CLA	RA, CA 95054		2822	

DATE MAILED: 07/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			A K			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/766,774	WILLIAMS ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		M. Wilczewski	2822			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply or period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuting reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fror e, cause the application to become ABANDON	mely filed ys will be considered timely. In the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1) 🏹	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 N</u>	March 2005				
· —		s action is non-final.				
3)□	·					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	 4) □ Claim(s) is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,40,84-114 and 117-174 is/are rejected. 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-39, 41-83, 115, 116, 175 and 174 is/are objected to. 8) ☒ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 					
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>07 March 2005</u> is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine The specification is objected.	a) accepted or b) objected or b) obj	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica prity documents have been receiv nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage			
Attachmen	• •					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 er No(s)/Mail Date		Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/766,774

Art Unit: 2822

DETAILED ACTION

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 84-114, 117, and 118 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim1-33, 36, and 37 of U.S. Patent No. 6,855,985. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the pending claims are generic to the patented claims.

Claims 119-174 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim71-126 of U.S. Patent No. 6,855,985. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the pending claims are generic to the patented claims.

Claim 40 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousnesstype double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 34 of U.S. Patent Application/Control Number: 10/766,774

Art Unit: 2822

No. 6,855,985. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 40 recites a family of transistor devices comprising at least NPN and PNP bipolar transistors and a CMOS pair and an isolation structure formed in a semiconductor substrate, which is the same structure recited in patented claims 1 and 34.

Claim 2 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 58 and 60 of U.S.

Patent No. 6,855,985. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claim 2 recites a family of transistor devices comprising at least a PNP bipolar transistor and a CMOS pair and an isolation structure formed in a semiconductor substrate, which is the same structure recited in patented claims 58 and 60.

Drawings

The drawings filed on March 7, 2005, are acceptable.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The additionally cited references disclose various isolation structures and bipolar-CMOS structures.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Wilczewski whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 2822

(571) 272-1849. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday and Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amir Zarabian can be reached on 571-272-1852. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M. Wilczewski Primary Examiner Tech Center 2800